

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05492 01 OF 02 051930Z

66

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-11 L-03 ACDA-19

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-07 MC-02 DRC-01 /121 W

----- 016284

P R 051550Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8014

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCNINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 5492

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MPOL, PFOR, NATO , US

SUBJECT: US TRILATERAL DPQ EXAMINATION

REF: A. USNATO 4942, PARA 3

B. USNATO 5090, PARA 2

C. USNATO 5268

D. USDELMC 871 DTG 031750Z OCT

1. INTERNATIONAL STAFF CIRCULATED ON OCTOBER 4 FIRST DRAFT OF 1974 COUNTRY CHAPTER ON US FORCE PLANS (FPD(74)72). MISSION IS SENDING DRAFT BY ARMED FORCES COURIER SERVICE (APO REG. NO.(4558, SCHEDULED TO ARRIVE PENTAGON CENTRAL REGISTRY AFTERNOON OCTOBER 8). OCTOBER 10/11 TRILATERAL SESSION IN WASHINGTON WILL INCLUDE CONSIDERATION OF IS PREPARED DRAFT CHAPTER (REF A AND B). COVER LETTER TO DRAFT CHAPTER FROM FORCE PLANNING DIRECTOR BRABAND/FOLLOWS:

ATTACHED IS A FIRST DRAFT OF THIS YEAR'S COUNTRY CHAPTER FOR THE UNITED STATES.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05492 01 OF 02 051930Z

2. WE REGRET VERY MUCH THAT YOUR AUTHORITIES SHOULD NOT HAVE FOUND IT POSSIBLE TO PROVIDE US WITH THEIR DPQ(74) REPLY AT OR ABOUT THE DATE OF 1ST AUGUST AS FORESEEN IN THE AGREED PROCEDURES FOR THE NATO DEFENCE PLANNING REVIEW OR IN ANY

CASE SUFFICIENTLY EARLY TO PREPARE THE TRILATERAL DISCUSSIONS IN AN ORDERLY FASHION. UNFORTUNATELY, YOUR REPLY ARRIVED SO LATE THAT ONLY A VERY SUPERFICIAL STUDY OF ITS CONTENTS COULD BE MADE BY THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF.

THE TIME LEFT FOR OUR PREPARATION OF THE TRILATERAL DISCUSSIONS WAS THUS TOTALLY INADEQUATE AND THIS MAKES IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR US TO CONDUCT THIS IMPORTANT PHASE OF THE DEFENCE REVIEW THE WAY IT SHOULD BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROCEDURE. IT ALSO MAKES IT DOUBTFUL WHETHER THE AMOUNTS OF MONEY AND THE TIME REQUIRED FOR THE DISCUSSIONS IN WASHINGTON CAN BE JUSTIFIED.

3. A PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF YOUR REPLY APPEARS TO INDICATE THAT IT IS COMPREHENSIVE AND IN DETAIL, ALTHOUGH YOUR AUTHORITIES' RESPONSES TO THE FORCE GOALS ARE NOT ALWAYS AS CLEAR AND SPECIFIC AS WE WOULD HAVE LIKED THEM TO BE.

4. WE REGRET THAT THE FINANCIAL DATA PROVIDED AGAIN COVERS ONLY THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR. FAILURE TO PROVIDE THESE DATA WILL, INTER ALIA, MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE TO PREPARE A REPORT NEXT YEAR ON "THE TOTAL RESOURCE ALLOCATION IN THE ALLIANCE, PROJECTED FOR AT LEAST FIVE YEARS" AS SUGGESTED BY YOUR ACTING PERMANENT REP AS BACKGROUND TO THE NEW MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE.

END TEXT.

2. DRAFT CHAPTER ALSO INCLUDES QUESTIONS IS INTENDS TO ASK DURING TRILATERAL EXAMINATION.

BEGIN TEXT:

I. QUESTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF

ARMY

1. MEMORANDUM, PAGE 10, LINES 6-10

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THERE SHORTFALLS IN WAR RESERVES FOR TANK AND ANTI-TANK CAPABILITY?

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05492 01 OF 02 051930Z

2. FORCE GOALS

A. SERIAL NO. 1L08 CALLS FOR CERTAIN PROVISION OF EW SUPPORT FOR NATO AT SIMPLE ALERT OR STATE ORANGE OR STATE SCARLET. CAN THE US AUTHORITIES CONFIRM THAT THEIR RESPONSE TO THIS GOAL INCLUDES SUCH A PROVISION OF EW UNITS TO NATO (TACTICAL COMMANDERS)?

B. SERIAL 1L11

THE RESPONSE DOES NOT ADDRESS THE PROVISION OF INCREASED RANGE AMMUNITIONS. HOWEVER, ON PAGE 7 OF THE MEMORANDUM, LINES 2-4, THE COMPLETION OF THE PROVISION OF ROCKET-ASSISTED

AMMUNITION FOR THE M-109 AL HOWITZER BY END-1979 HAS BEEN

MENTIONED. DOES THIS STATEMENT ALSO APPLY TO THIS FORCE GOAL?

C. SERIAL 1L12

THIS FORCE GOAL ALSO CALLS FOR CONVERSION OF 175 MM GUNS TO THE IMPROVED 8 INCH HOWITZER AND PROVISION OF INCREASED RANGE AMMUNITIONS BY 1977. AS THIS HAS NOT BEEN ADDRESSED CAN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION BE PROVIDED?

D. SERIAL 1L15

THE REVIEW OF REINFORCEMENT AND MOVEMENT PLANS HAS NOT BEEN ADDRESSED SPECIFICALLY IN THE RESPONSE, NEITHER HAVE THE MARINE AMPHIBIOUS FORCES (MAFS). CAN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION BE PROVIDED?

E. SERIAL 1L16

CAN IT BE CONFIRMED THAT THE GOAL WILL BE MET FULLY BY REPLACING THE CURRENT M-113 APCs BY END-1980?

F. SERIAL 1L17

ARE THE US AUTHORITIES OF THE OPINION THAT INTRODUCTION OF A NEW ARSV WILL START IN 1978?

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05492 01 OF 02 051930Z

G. SERIAL 1L24

WHEN ARE RESULTS OF THE DISCUSSIONS EXPECTED TO MEET THIS GOAL?

H. SERIAL 1L25

DOES THE RESPONSE IMPLY THAT THE ACCB WILL NOT BE STATIONED IN EUROPE?

J. SERIALS 1L27 AND 1L32

COULD THE REASONS BE GIVEN WHY THESE GOALS ARE REJECTED?

K. SERIAL 1L31

DOES THE RESPONSE ALSO APPLY TO THE REPLACEMENT OF THE NIKE AIR DEFENCE MISSILE SYSTEM?

L. SERIAL 1LO2S

COULD MORE INFORMATION BE PROVIDED IN ORDER TO ASSESS WHETHER THE GOAL WILL BE MET? SEE ALSO QUESTION 2(D).

3. ANNEX I TO TABLE II (PERSONNEL)

THE PLANNED STRENGTH OF ACTIVE DUTY FORCES COMMITTED TO NATO WILL INCREASE FROM 323,400 IN 1974 TO 347,000 BY END-1979.

THERE IS ALSO AN INCREASE IN THE WAR AUTHORISED STRENGTH
FOR NATO COMMITTED FORCES DURING 1975-1979. CAN THIS BE EXPLAINED?

4. IN THE MEMORANDUM, PAGE2, LINES 5 AND 6, 11 DIVISIONS,
17 BRIGADES AND TWO SPECIAL FORCES GROUPS UNDER NATIONAL
COMMAND HAVE BEEN MENTIONED. HOWEVER, IN TABLE I, PAGE
A-1, A TOTAL OF 20 UNITS OF BRIGADE SIZE HAS BEEN REPORTED.
COULD TTHIS BE ELABORATED ON?

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 05492 02 OF 02 051943Z

66

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-11 L-03 ACDA-19

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-07 MC-02 DRC-01 /121 W

----- 016335

P R 051550Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8015

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCNINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 5492

NAVY

QUESTIONS

1. COULD MORE INFORMATION BE PROVIDED REGARDING THE GOLOBAL
DEPLOYMENT OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS IN ORDER TO EXPLAIN THE REDUCTION
IN THE AVAILABILITY OF THOSE EARMARKED TO SACLANT AND SACEUR?

2. IS ANY CUT -BACK ENVISAGED IN THE SEA CONTROL SHIP PROGRAMME?

3. DOES THE ALLOCATION OF 5 DLGNS TO THE ATLANTIC FLEET INDICATE
THAT THEY ARE ASSIGNED TO SACLANT?

4. COULD SOME INDICATION BE GIVEN OF THE NUMBER AND TYPE
OF CRUISERS INCLUDED IN THE CRUISER/DESTROYER LEADER TOTALS?

5. CAN ANY FURTHER INFORMATION BE GIVEN REGARDING THE
V/STOL PROJECT SUCH AS AN ESTIMATE OF THE DATE OF ENTRY INTO
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05492 02 OF 02 051943Z

SERVICE?

6. CAN MORE BE SAID ABOUT THE ENTRY INTO SERVICE OF THE F-14 AIRCRAFT, MK 48 AND MK 46 TORPEDOES?

7. FIGURES FOR ACTIVE SERVICE PERSONNEL HAVE FALLEN FROM THOSE ANNOUNCED LAST YEAR. WOULD YOU COMMENT?

8. WILL FORCE GOALS 1M05S AND 2M10/11/12 BE MET IN FULL?

9. WILL THE SECOND PART OF FORCE GOAL 1M07S BE MET?

10. CAN IT BE ASSUMED THAT FORCE GOAL 2M03 WILL BE MET?

11. CAN MORE BE SAID ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF THE MCM FORCE BEING DEPLOYED TO ICELAND (FORCE GOAL 2M16/17)?

12. COULD YOU COMMENT ON RECENT PRESS REPORTS ON THE B 52S EMPLOYMENT IN THE ANTI-SURFACE STRIKE ROLE?

AIR FORCE (SEE ALSO USNATO 5268)

1. THE UNITED STATES AUTHORITIES ENVISAGE TO DECREASE THE AVAILABILITY STATUS OF TWO RF-4C SQUADRONS TO A-3 AFTER 1975. AS A COMPENSATORY MEASURE THEY ENVISAGE STATIONING IN THE THEATRE OR INCREASING AVAILABILITY THROUGH TEMPORARY DEPLOYMENT OF UP TO TWO SQUADRONS OF TACTICAL FIGHTERS FROM SACEURS STRATEGIC RESERVE.

A. COULD YOU INDICATE WHERE THE RECONNAISSANCE SQUADRONS WILL BE STATIONED?

B. THE TWO RECONNAISSANCE SQUADRONS MAY BE REPLACED BY TWO SQUADRONS OF TACTICAL FIGHTERS . COULD YOU COMMENT ON THIS CHANGE IN ROLE?

C. COULD YOU INDICATE WHERE THE STATIONING IN THE THEATRE OR TEMPORARY DEPLOYMENT OF THE FIGHTER SQUADRONS IS LIKELY TO TAKE PLACE?

2. COULD INFORMATION BE PROVIDED IN RESPECT OF ON-GOING SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05492 02 OF 02 051943Z

EVALUATION OF NEW SHELTER CONCEPTS? (MEMORANDUM, PAGE 51, LINE 29 REFERS).

3. WITH REFERENCE TO THE NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING COB AND THE PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR STRATEGIC AIRLIFT COULD INFORMATION BE PROVIDED (MEMORANDUM, PAGE 52, LINES 4 TO 7 AND 19 TO 20 REFER);

A. IN WHICH COUNTRIES THE GEERAL ARRANGEMENT ON THE COB
CONCEPT IS COMPLETED AND WHERE IT IS OUTSTANDING?

B. THE RESPONSE OF THE COUNTRIES SELECTED AS PRIMARY
STAGING BASES FOR STRATEGIC AIRLIFT.

B. ECONOMIC DIRECTORATE FURNISHED FOLLOWING QUESTIONS/
TOPICS

(NOT INCLUDED IN DRAFT CHAPTER):

BEGIN TEXT:

FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS/TOPICS

THE REPLY TO DPQ(74) CONTAINS FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC
INFORMATION RELATING ONLY TO THE DEFENCE AND THE BALANCE OF
PAYMENTS POSITION UP TO FY 1974/75. DISCUSSION WOULD
BE WELCOMED ON ANY POINTS ARISING FROM THE TEXT AND FIGURES
IN THE FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC PART OF DRAFT US CHAPTER.

QUESTION

A. CAN SOME INDICATION BE GIVEN OF THE LEVEL OF RESOURCE
ALLOCATIONS FOR DEFENCE ON WHICH THE DEFENCE PLANS THROUTH
1979 ARE BASED?

B. CAN FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS RELATING
TO (A) ABOVE BE COVERED DURING DISCUSSION. (E.G. THE ECONOMIC
EXPECTATIONS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES FOR THE MEDIUM TERM)

C. HIGH RATES OF INFLATION WHICH ARE AFFECTING ALL GOVERNMENT
EXPENDITURES, HAVE CAUSED A DRASTIC UPWARD REVUIWION OF THE COSTS
OF MAJOR US WEAPON PROGRAMMES-AN INCREASE OF \$16.9

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05492 02 OF 02 051943Z

BILLION IN THE 3 MONTHS TO JUNE ACCORDING TO PRESS REPORTS.
HOW IS HIS EXPECTED TO AFFECT PROCUREMENT PROGRAMMES?
WHAT PROCEDURES ARE FOLLOWED TO ALLEVIATE THE UNFORESEEN
IMPACT OF INFLATION ON THE REAL LEVEL OF DEFENCE EXPENDI-
TURES?

2. SPECIAL TOPICS THAT MERIT DISCUSSION IF TIME PERMITS.

A. METHODS OF IMPROVING THE PRESENTATION IN SUMMARY
FORM OF THE INDICATORS OF A COUNTRY'S DEFENCE EFFORT. (REF:
FOLLOW-UP TABLE ON PAGE 31 FPD(74)72, ANNEX I, TO PROPOSALS
MADE BY MR. LEBER, MINISTER OF DEFENCE FOR THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC
OF GERMANY, AT THE JUNE DEFENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
IN BRUSSELS).

B. CRITERIA THAT MIGHT BE USED IN DRAFTING RESOURCE
GUIDANCE FOR APPLICATION TO NATO FORCE PLANNING. (E.G.

MERITS OF USING VOLUME INCREASES AND/OR DEFENCE SHARE OF GNP).

3. USDELMC SENT IMS QUESTIONS BY REF D; MISSION SENT SHAPE
QUESTIONS BY SEPTTEL.

4. COMMENT: IS OBVIOUSLY INTENDS TO DISCUSS MINISTERIAL
GUIDANCE (PARTICULARLY RESOURCE GUIDANCE) IN WASHINGTON.
END COMMENT: MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 OCT 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO05492
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryxpo.tel
Line Count: 333
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 4942, PARA 3 B. USNATO 5090, PARA 2 C. USNATO 5268 D. USDELMC 871 DTG 031750Z OCT
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 04 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <04 APR 2002 by boyleja>; APPROVED <24 JUL 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: US TRILATERAL DPQ EXAMINATION
TAGS: MPOL, PFOR, NATO , US
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO USNMR SHAPE
USCNINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
CINCLANT
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

